

To: Joel R. Feldman(atltrademark@gtlaw.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97148279 - LATITUDES - 193021010000
Sent: May 08, 2023 10:49:05 AM EDT
Sent As: tmng.notices@uspto.gov

Attachments

[6570167](#)

United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
Office Action (Official Letter) About Applicant's Trademark Application

U.S. Application Serial No. 97148279

Mark: LATITUDES

Correspondence Address:

Joel R. Feldman
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
3333 PIEDMONT ROAD, NE, SUITE 2500
ATLANTA GA 30305 UNITED STATES

Applicant: Margaritaville Alcohol Beverage Trust

Reference/Docket No. 193021010000

Correspondence Email Address: atltrademark@gtlaw.com

NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION

Response deadline. File a response to this nonfinal Office action within three months of the “Issue date” below to avoid [abandonment](#) of the application. Review the Office action and respond using one of the links to the appropriate electronic forms in the “How to respond” section below.

Request an extension. For a fee, applicant may [request one three-month extension](#) of the response deadline prior to filing a response. The request must be filed within three months of the “Issue date” below. If the extension request is granted, the USPTO must receive applicant’s response to this letter within six months of the “Issue date” to avoid abandonment of the application.

Issue date: May 8, 2023

This Office action is supplemental to and supersedes the previous Office action issued on September 20, 2022 in connection with this application. The assigned trademark examining attorney wishes to correct the record by addressing the issue inadvertently omitted from the previous Office action. *See* TMEP §§706, 711.02. The trademark examining attorney apologizes for any inconvenience caused by

the delay in raising this issue.

The following requirement raised in the September 20, 2022 Office action has been satisfied: domicile requirement. *See* TMEP §713.02.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES that applicant must address:

- New issue: Section 2(d) Refusal - Likelihood of Confusion

Section 2(d) Refusal - Likelihood of Confusion

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 6570167. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

Applicant's mark is LATITUDES, in standard characters, for use on:

Class 33: Wine

The registered mark in U.S. Registration No. 6570167 is FIVE LATITUDES, in standard characters, for use on:

Class 33: Wine

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that is so similar to a registered mark that it is likely consumers would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the commercial source of the goods and/or services of the parties. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). Likelihood of confusion is determined on a case-by-case basis by applying the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) (called the “*du Pont* factors”). *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1322, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Any evidence of record related to those factors need be considered; however, “not all of the *DuPont* factors are relevant or of similar weight in every case.” *In re Guild Mortg. Co.*, 912 F.3d 1376, 1379, 129 USPQ2d 1160, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (quoting *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1406, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

Although not all *du Pont* factors may be relevant, there are generally two key considerations in any likelihood of confusion analysis: (1) the similarities between the compared marks and (2) the relatedness of the compared goods and/or services. *See In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d at 1322, 123 USPQ2d at 1747 (quoting *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1164-65, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976) (“The fundamental inquiry mandated by [Section] 2(d) goes to the cumulative effect of differences in the essential characteristics of the goods [or services] and differences in the marks.”); TMEP §1207.01.

Comparison of the Marks

Marks are compared in their entirety for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP

§1207.01(b)-(b)(v). “Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar.” *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014)), *aff’d per curiam*, 777 F. App’x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); TMEP §1207.01(b).

In this case, applicant's mark is LATITUDES and registrant's mark is FIVE LATITUDES.

Incorporating the entirety of one mark within another does not obviate the similarity between the compared marks, as in the present case, nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). *See Wella Corp. v. Cal. Concept Corp.*, 558 F.2d 1019, 1022, 194 USPQ 419, 422 (C.C.P.A. 1977) (holding CALIFORNIA CONCEPT and surfer design and CONCEPT confusingly similar); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (holding BENGAL LANCER and design and BENGAL confusingly similar); *Double Coin Holdings, Ltd. v. Tru Dev.*, 2019 USPQ2d 377409, at *6-7 (TTAB 2019) (holding ROAD WARRIOR and WARRIOR (stylized) confusingly similar); *In re Mr. Recipe, LLC*, 118 USPQ2d 1084, 1090 (TTAB 2016) (holding JAWS DEVOUR YOUR HUNGER and JAWS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). In the present case, the marks are identical in part.

Further, although applicant’s mark does not contain the entirety of the registered mark, applicant’s mark is likely to appear to prospective purchasers as a shortened form of registrant’s mark. *See In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1348, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (quoting *United States Shoe Corp.*, 229 USPQ 707, 709 (TTAB 1985)). Thus, merely omitting some of the wording from a registered mark may not overcome a likelihood of confusion. *See In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 94 USPQ2d 1257; *In re Optica Int’l*, 196 USPQ 775, 778 (TTAB 1977); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ii)-(iii). In this case, applicant’s mark does not create a distinct commercial impression from the registered mark because it contains some of the wording in the registered mark and does not add any wording that would distinguish it from that mark. Both marks share the identical dominant word LATITUDES, which is the entirety of applicant's mark. Applicant's mark is likely to be viewed as a shortened form or within the same family of marks as the registered mark.

Therefore, applicant's mark and registrant's mark share the same commercial impression and are confusingly similar.

Comparison of the Goods

The goods and/or services are compared to determine whether they are similar, commercially related, or travel in the same trade channels. *See Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int’l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(a)(vi).

When analyzing an applicant’s and registrant’s goods and/or services for similarity and relatedness, that determination is based on the description of the goods and/or services in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1323, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Octocom Sys. Inc. v. Hous. Computers Servs. Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 942, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

In this case, the goods in the application and registration are identical. Therefore, it is presumed that the channels of trade and class of purchasers are the same for these goods. *See Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, 901 F.3d 1367, 1372, 127 USPQ2d 1797, 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (quoting *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d

1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012)). Thus, applicant's and registrant's goods are related.

Because the marks are confusingly similar and the goods are related, there is a likelihood of confusion between the marks. Consequently, registration is refused pursuant to Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

Response Guidelines

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although an examining attorney cannot provide legal advice, the examining attorney can provide additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

The USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions; however, emails can be used for informal communications and are included in the application record. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

How to respond. File a [response form to this nonfinal Office action](#) or file a [request form for an extension of time to file a response](#).

/Jenna Herr/
Jenna Herr
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 101
(571) 272-9165
Jenna.Herr@uspto.gov

RESPONSE GUIDANCE

- **Missing the deadline for responding to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** A response or extension request must be received by the USPTO before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response deadline. Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) [system availability](#) could affect an applicant's ability to timely respond. For help resolving technical issues with TEAS, email TEAS@uspto.gov.
- **[Responses signed by an unauthorized party](#) are not accepted and can **cause the application to abandon**.** If applicant does not have an attorney, the response must be signed by the individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with [legal authority to bind a juristic applicant](#). If applicant has an attorney, the response must be signed by the attorney.
- If needed, **find [contact information for the supervisor](#)** of the office or unit listed in the signature block.

Print: Mon May 08 2023

88881358

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

FIVE LATITUDES

Mark Punctuated
FIVE LATITUDES

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 033. US 047 049.G & S: Wine. FIRST USE: 20200822. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20200822

Mark Drawing Code
(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Design Code

Serial Number
88881358

Filing Date
20200421

Current Filing Basis
1A

Original Filing Basis
1B

Publication for Opposition Date
20200818

Registration Number
6570167

Date Registered
20211123

Owner
(REGISTRANT) Pampa Beverages, LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY FLORIDA 1110 Brickell Ave.,
Suite 302 Miami FLORIDA 33131

Priority Date

Disclaimer Statement

Description of Mark

Type of Mark
TRADEMARK

Register
PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

Stephanie Alvarez

United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)

USPTO OFFICIAL NOTICE

Office Action (Official Letter) has issued
on May 8, 2023 for
U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97148279

A USPTO examining attorney has reviewed your trademark application and issued an Office action. You must respond to this Office action to avoid your application abandoning. Follow the steps below.

- (1) **[Read the Office action](#)**. This email is NOT the Office action.
- (2) **Respond to the Office action by the deadline** using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). Your response, or extension request, must be received by the USPTO on or before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response deadline. Otherwise, your application will be [abandoned](#). See the Office action itself regarding how to respond.
- (3) **Direct general questions** about using USPTO electronic forms, the USPTO [website](#), the application process, the status of your application, and whether there are outstanding deadlines to the [Trademark Assistance Center \(TAC\)](#).

After reading the Office action, address any question(s) regarding the specific content to the USPTO examining attorney identified in the Office action.

GENERAL GUIDANCE

- **[Check the status](#) of your application periodically** in the [Trademark Status & Document Retrieval \(TSDR\)](#) database to avoid missing critical deadlines.
- **[Update your correspondence email address](#)** to ensure you receive important USPTO notices about your application.
- **[Beware of trademark-related scams](#)**. Protect yourself from people and companies that may try to take financial advantage of you. Private companies may call you and pretend to be the USPTO or may send you communications that resemble official USPTO documents to trick you. We will never request your credit card number or social security number over the phone. Verify the correspondence originated from us by using your serial number in our database, [TSDR](#), to confirm that it appears under the “Documents” tab, or contact the [Trademark Assistance Center](#).
- **[Hiring a U.S.-licensed attorney](#)**. If you do not have an attorney and are not required to

have one under the trademark rules, we encourage you to hire a U.S.-licensed attorney specializing in trademark law to help guide you through the registration process. The USPTO examining attorney is not your attorney and cannot give you legal advice, but rather works for and represents the USPTO in trademark matters.